

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Priority Status

The office requested identification of the priority claim of the instant application. The applicant has amended the specification accordingly. The office's concern should be overcome.

Specification Objection

The office objected to the abstract as including extraneous content. A replacement abstract is submitted herewith, and the office's concern should be overcome.

35 USC § 112(2nd paragraph)

Claims 2 and 3 were rejected under 35 USC § 112(2nd) as being indefinite for reciting "...installing both the coke drum and the valve within two month of each other..." and for reciting "... installing the valve more than one month after installing the coke drum...". The applicant amended the claims (for support, see e.g., page 5, ln 19-25), and believes that the office's concerns should now be overcome.

35 USC § 103(a)

Claims 1-17 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being obvious over Lah et al (U.S. Pat. No. 6,565,714) in view of Antalffy et al (U.S. Pat. No. 5,098,524). The applicant disagrees for various reasons.

More specifically, claim 1 as amended requires a step of "...horizontally moving the body and the valve to so initially position the body and valve..." into a proper position. Such adjustment is not taught or suggested by Lah and/or Antalffy. Indeed, such positioning is neither possible nor desirable with the device of Antalffy. Antalffy simply requires pivotal movement to open and close the drum and any additional horizontal movement would misalign the drum head. Moreover, the examiner appears to argue that Antalffy would teach use of a hydraulic actuator to raise and lower the head. Such statement is at least somewhat misleading as only a portion of the head is lowered and raised (portion opposite the hinge). None of the cited references provide any motivation or need for modification such as to arrive at the presently claimed subject matter. For at least these reasons and the amendments herein, the rejection should be withdrawn.

In view of the present amendments and arguments, the applicant believes that all claims are now in condition for allowance. Therefore, the applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

Fish & Associates

Date: April 6, 2010

By: /Martin Fessenmaier/
Martin Fessenmaier, Ph.D.
Reg. No. 46,697
Tel.: (949) 943-8300